DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 933 24 TE 001 578

AUTHOR	Jacobs, Paul H.; Crisp, Raymond D.
TITLE	The Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers in Educational Measurement and Evaluation. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.
Spons Agency	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No	BR-5-0789
Pub Date	Jul 69
Contract	CEC-5-10-029
Note	61p.
Available from	Paul H. Jacobs, Dept. of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 61801 (free or on loan)
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors	Beginning Teachers, Educational Testing, *English Instruction, *Evaluation Methods, Measurement Instruments, Measurement Techniques, Preservice Education, Secondary Education, *Secondary School Teachers, Student Evaluation, Student Testing, *Teacher Education, *Testing
Identifiers	Project English

Abstract

The objectives of this study were (1) to learn the classroom practices, procedures, and level of competency in educational measurement and evaluation of experienced Illinois secondary school English teachers (grades 7-12) and (2) to determine, on the basis of experienced English teachers' judgments, the desirable level of competency for beginning secondary school English teachers with a bachelor's degree. The investigators' "Questionnaire on Educational Measurement in English" and Samuel T. Mayo's "Checklist of Measurement Competencies" were sent to 500 English teachers selected at random. Among the results of the survey based on 263 replies were that (1) over 63% of the English teachers believed their present knowledge in measurement and evaluation to be sufficient for their needs, (2) the kinds of tests most often used by teachers were the essay and the short-answer examinations, (3) the most frequently used means of evaluation consisted of theme writing, (4) all teachers discussed results of tests with their students, (5) almost half of the teachers reported the regular administration of a standardized test, (6) training in educational measurement was considered

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PA - 24
BR - 5 - 0787

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED033933

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-19-32-66

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

The Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers in Educational Measurement and Evaluation

Paul H. Jacobs
Raymond D. Crisp

University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

July 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TE 001 578

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Associate Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Associate: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 West California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Raymond D. Crisp, University of Illinois (non-voting), 1966-9
William H. Evans, University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University, 1964-6
John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, 1964-6; chairman, 1965-6
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University, 1966-9; chairman, 1967-8
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois, 1964-9
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois, 1964-9 (non-voting, 1964-6)
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University, 1967-9; chairman, 1968-9
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, 1964-8; chairman, 1964-5
Roy K. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, 1964-9; chairman, 1966-7

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and Paul Sawyer
DePaul University - Margaret M. Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald R. Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmestad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - James Barry and Sister Mary Constantine
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
Saint Xavier College - Thomas Deegan and George K. McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy K. Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet A. Emig and Robert Parker
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Alfred J. Lindsey and Sherman Rush

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
W. Nelson Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel L. Gage, Stanford University
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
Clarence W. Hach, Evanston Township High School
William Riley Parker, Indiana University (deceased)
Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William D. Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, former Executive Secretary, NCTE
Donald R. Tuttle, U. S. Office of Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For the wisdom and knowledge they so generously shared with us as we prepared for and conducted this study, we are greatly indebted to Professor Samuel T. Mayo, author of "Checklist of Measurement Competencies" and the former director of Cooperative Research Project No. 5-0807,[1] which was recently completed at Loyola University, Chicago, and to Professor J. Thomas Hastings, Director of the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation at the University of Illinois, Urbana, and the former director of Cooperative Research Project No. 509.[2]

For his encouragement and wise counsel, we owe a special debt of gratitude to Dr. J. N. Hook, Professor of English and Director of the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana.

P.H.J.
R.D.C.

---

[1] *Preservice Preparation of Teachers in Educational Measurement*, Final Report, 1967.

[2] *The Use of Test Results*, Final Report, 1960.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES v

CHAPTER

I SUMMARY
Purposes 1
Methods 1
Results 2
Conclusions 3

II INTRODUCTION
The Problem 4
In High School (and College) English Classrooms 4
In Preservice Programs for Teachers of English 6
In Inservice Experiences and Programs for Teachers of English 7
Purposes and Objectives 8

III METHODS
Development and Use of "Questionnaire on Educational Measurement in English" 9
Use of "Checklist of Measurement Competencies" 10
Treatment of the Data 10

IV RESULTS
Analysis of the Questionnaire Data 12
Background Information 12
Preparation in Educational Measurement 15
Adequacy of Preparation in Educational Measurement . . . 19
Desirable Preparation in Educational Measurement 20
Testing and Evaluating Practices of English Teachers . . 22
Use of Standardized Tests in English 25
Familiarity with Standard Publications on Educational Measurement and Evaluation 25
Analysis of the Checklist Data 28
Standardized Tests 29
Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests 36
Uses of Measurement and Evaluation 36
Statistical Concepts 36
Correlations 37

V CONCLUSIONS 40

VI RECOMMENDATIONS 41

APPENDICES
A "Questionnaire on Educational Measurement in English 43
B Instructions for Completing "Checklist of Measurement Competencies" 56

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Enrollments of Schools Represented in the Study	13
2	Number of Students Per Class	13
3	Grade Levels of Classes Taught	13
4	English Classes Taught per Day	14
5	Lesson Preparations per Day	14
6	Degrees Held by Responding Teachers	14
7	College Credit Hours Earned beyond the Highest Degree	16
7A	College Credit Hours Earned beyond the Bachelor's Degree	16
7B	College Credit Hours Earned beyond the Master's Degree	16
8	Number of Years of Teaching Experience Represented by the Respondents	17
8A	Four-Year Intervals	17
8B	Ten-Year Intervals	17
8C	Twenty-Five-Year Intervals	17
9	Types and Frequencies of Measurement Courses or Courses Involving Measurement Taken by Teachers in the Study	18
10	Source of Knowledge of Educational Measurement and Evaluation	18
11	Types of Teacher-Made Tests and Frequency of Use	22
12	Other Means of Measurement and Frequency of Use	23
13	Frequency of Occurrence of Written or Oral Quizzes	24
14	Source and Frequency of Test Criticism Sought by Teachers in the Study	24
15	Source and Frequency of Selection, Administration, and Interpretation of Standardized English Tests	24
16	Degree of Familiarity with Various Standardized English Tests	26
17	Degree of Familiarity with Various Publications on Educational Measurement and Evaluation	27
18	Frequencies and Percentages of Mean Ratings for the Major Categories of the Checklist	28
19	Frequency Distribution of Ratings by Major Categories of the Checklist	29
20	Frequencies and Percentages of Ratings and Overall Mean Rating of the Seventy Statements on the Checklist	30
21	Correlation Matrix of Independent and Dependent Variables	39

CHAPTER I

SUMMARY

Purposes

This study was designed to obtain information about the classroom practices and procedures and the level of competency in educational measurement and evaluation of experienced Illinois secondary school English teachers (grades 7-12) and to attempt to determine, on the basis of experienced English teachers' judgments, the level of competency desirable in beginning secondary school English teachers with a bachelor's degree.

Methods

In order to achieve the first primary objective of this study, the investigators constructed "Questionnaire on Educational Measurement in English," which was designed to obtain the following kinds of information from the teachers participating in the study: highest degree held, years of experience, teaching levels, class loads, course work taken in educational measurement and evaluation and in educational psychology, types of tests constructed and administered in their classrooms, use of test results, frequency of testing in their classrooms, other types of evaluative measurements used, and degree of familiarity with well-known standardized tests in English and with standard textbooks and other publications on educational measurement and evaluation.

To obtain the information necessary for achieving the second objective, the investigators borrowed from Professor Samuel T. Mayo of Loyola University, Chicago, his "Checklist of Measurement Competencies," which he had prepared for use in Cooperative Research Project #5-0807. This instrument was designed and used by Professor Mayo to find out the degrees of importance that experienced educators (elementary and high school teachers; school principals and superintendents; college teachers of measurement; measurement specialists in local, state, and private agencies; and guidance workers) attach to 70 specific measurement competencies proposed as desirable for beginning teachers to possess. As a part of the present study, the Checklist was used for the same purpose but with experienced English teachers only. The major categories of competencies included are Standardized Tests, Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests, Uses of Measurement and Evaluation, and Statistical Concepts. The Checklist asked the respondents to rate the importance of these 70 statements on a scale of "Is Essential," "Is Desirable," "Is of Little Importance," or "Do Not Understand Statement."

By a random-sampling process of the then-current membership list of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English, 500 teachers of English in Illinois public and parochial secondary schools were selected to participate in this study. The two survey instruments, along with a letter inviting participation, were mailed to the teachers on October 3, 1966.

Results

The Questionnaire and Checklist were completed by 263 teachers in the sample, a percentage of 52.60.

The majority of the teachers (40.68%) have taught ten years or less, and over half of the respondents (55.89%) hold the master's degree. One hundred forty-three teachers (54.37%) reported that they have had some course work in educational measurement and evaluation, including the construction and use of tests. Almost as many teachers indicated that they have not had such course work. One hundred sixty-eight of the responding teachers (63.89%) believe that their present knowledge is sufficient for their needs as English teachers. However, a percentage of 36.11 feel that their knowledge in this area is inadequate.

By far the majority of the respondents (69.58%) believe that a prospective secondary school English teacher should have as a portion of his undergraduate preparation substantial training in educational measurement and evaluation.

Responding English teachers indicated that they construct and use most often essay and short-answer examinations. Multiple-choice and completion tests are sometimes used; true-false and matching tests are the least often used. The respondents reported that the "theme" is the most frequently used means of measurement, with "cumulative writing folders" and "informal diagnostic questioning" also being used rather frequently. Written or oral quizzes are most often given on a weekly basis in the English classroom. All teachers who completed the Questionnaire reported that they discuss the results of their tests with their students.

Almost half of the responding teachers (42.21%) reported that a standardized English test is administered in their schools on a regular basis. Generally, it is the guidance counselor who selects the tests, but it is the individual teachers who administer them. Interpretation of the results is a shared responsibility of teachers and the guidance counselor.

The standardized test used most often by English teachers in this study is the Center-Durost Literature Acquaintance Test. The tests ranking second and third in terms of use are, respectively, the Durost-Center Word Mastery Test and the Cooperative Literary Comprehension and Appreciation Test.

The standard textbook on educational measurement and evaluation reported as having been read and used by the largest number of teachers (204) is Herschel T. Manuel's Elementary Statistics for Teachers.

On the Checklist, Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests is the major category considered most important by the respondents in its relationship to the teaching of English and in its potential significance to beginning high school English teachers. Of the teachers responding, 29.65 percent consider this category "Essential," and 67.68 percent rate it "Desirable." The second most important category is that of Standardized Tests, with 19.39 percent of the teachers rating it "Essential" and 76.04 percent rating it "Desirable." Of almost equal ranking for the second most important category is Uses of Measurement and Evaluation; here, 18.63 percent of the teachers rate it "Essential" and 73.00 percent, "Desirable."

Almost half of the teachers (47.52%) consider the category Statistical Concepts "Of Little Importance" to the beginning teacher of English. Yet, 38.78 percent of the respondents consider 13 of the 34 items which make up this category as "Desirable," and 11.40 percent of the teachers checked the "Do Not Understand" rating for four of the statements in this category.

Conclusions

A statistically significant correlation was obtained for the number of courses in educational measurement and the sub- and overall mean ratings of the statements in the Checklist. No other independent variables held a significant correlation with the ratings, but one correlation involving only the respondents who had taken courses beyond their highest degrees indicates that these courses probably included educational measurement.

The findings of this study further indicate that a substantial amount of training in educational measurement, beyond what is presently given in most programs for preparing secondary school English teachers, would be very valuable to future high school English teachers. This indication is based on the judgments of the experienced English teachers in this study, as well as on the correlations which reveal that, if teachers are to possess the educational measurement concepts, abilities, and behaviors which they themselves consider important, then increased study of educational measurement and evaluation *per se* should be included in programs for preparing English teachers.

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

In High School (and College) English Classrooms

Measurement and evaluation of learning are probably the most vexing problems in education today. The fact that they are problems in the late 1960's by no means implies that they have only recently become problems; they have been such all along, even from the time when the first parents began to try to find out how well their first offspring was learning the lessons of survival--the same lessons that they had had to learn completely by trial and error and had then tried to pass on to him in the hope that he would not falter quite so often as they had.

Problems of measurement and evaluation are, of course, not confined to any particular subject, to any particular grade level. They lurk in every classroom from the nursery-school level through the post-doctoral level. They exist in the teaching and learning of electrical engineering, mathematics, woodworking, cooking, painting, and social studies, just as they do in the teaching and learning of English. However, because so many of the objectives of English instruction fall into what the profession nowadays refers to as the "affective domain," it stands to reason that problems of measurement and evaluation in the English classroom are probably more numerous and more complex than they are in some other classrooms.

Measurement and evaluation of learning are integral parts of the instructional process, and unless they are treated as such, the process is incomplete, much like a house without a roof on it. The teacher who begins his career without at least a broad understanding of the basic principles of evaluation and test construction is only a part-teacher. More than that, because he is constantly in the position of judging and evaluating his students, he runs the risk of damaging irreparably their egos and self-concepts. To say the least, this is a critical matter, one that some groups in the profession can no longer continue to treat lightly.

No teacher, even the one with thirty or forty-five years of experience, knows as much as he should about the measurement and evaluation of learning. But it is almost certain that the beginning teacher knows less and that he will make more mistakes. Although almost all teachers possess some of the following deficiencies or shortcomings, the beginner is more likely to possess them:

a. He fails to realize (as stated earlier) that measurement and evaluation must be constant integral components of the teaching-learning process.

b. He lacks a thorough understanding of the relationships between daily classroom discussion and questioning, on the one hand, and measurement and evaluation, on the other.

c. He does not fully understand the role of diagnosis and diagnostic testing in the instructional process, nor does he know how to use the results of such procedures once he has the results.

d. He teaches one thing, but tests on achievement of another. When he sits down to construct a test, he fails to refer back to the objectives he previously prepared for the particular lesson, week, or unit--much less for longer periods of time--that the test is to cover.

e. In his setting up of objectives for a unit or some other segment of study, he fails to look ahead to the various specific ways by which he might measure student achievement of the objectives.

f. Oftentimes his objectives are vaguely formulated and phrased, and then only in his mind, not on paper. Oftentimes, too, his quiz and test questions are equally vaguely formulated and phrased.

g. His students too often do not clearly understand what they are supposed to be learning. He does not involve his students in the setting up of objectives; in other words, he keeps his objectives a secret from them.

h. He fails to develop in his students a realistic attitude toward testing, in other words, an awareness that regardless of how good or comprehensive, no test can adequately measure everything students may have learned in the course of studying a given lesson or unit. Moreover, he is reluctant to admit to his students that, in the final analysis, their very own honest evaluations of what they have learned are probably more reliable than his.

i. He does not involve students often enough in self-evaluation, nor does he employ peer-evaluation as frequently as he should. In fact he has forgotten, or perhaps he never learned, that high school students generally accept more readily the evaluations of their peers than of their teachers.

j. He fails to teach his students that tests are used to determine their strengths as well as to indicate weaknesses and areas in which they need further study.

k. He is not completely honest with his students: he is reluctant to admit quite frankly to them that every test question they fail indicates, at least to some extent, a failure on his part.

l. When determining student's grades, he relies entirely too heavily on scores from formal tests, failing to recognize the significance and the validity of a variety of less formal measurement devices, such as, classroom discussion, informal questioning, questionnaires, inventories of

students' reading in their free time, cumulative reading and writing records, observation scales for various purposes, and checklists of various kinds.

m. He holds too much respect for standardized tests, and over-estimates the reliability of the scores his students make on such tests. Moreover, sometimes he is guilty of the following almost unforgivable mistakes: (1) using tests that evaluate for achievement of objectives that are unrelated to his own objectives, without realizing this fact, and (2) consciously directing his instruction so as to make certain that his students make high scores on a particular test.

n. Too often he fails to use the results of his tests, along with any other measurement devices he employs, in planning further instruction and in reconsidering his methods, procedures, and techniques.

o. Because he has only a vague understanding of many of the common terms and procedures in measurement and evaluation, he is unable to interpret accurately the results from standardized tests, as well as his own tests.

Obviously, this is by no means an exhaustive listing of the educational measurement and evaluation deficiencies of many beginning teachers. However, it should be adequate for its purpose: simply to refresh the reader's memory.

In Preservice Programs for Teachers of English

To say that colleges and universities which prepare prospective English (and other) teachers have an undergraduate program in educational measurement and evaluation would be no less than to tell a lie. What perhaps a half of them do have, however, is a series of two or possibly three bits or segments of instruction in measurement and evaluation. The first bit is offered in the course usually called "Educational Psychology." This course, which in most colleges and universities is designed to deal mainly with the principles and materials of mental hygiene and the psychology of learning, does usually devote some time, occasionally as much as a third of a semester, to measurement and evaluation of learning.

If the undergraduate preparing to become an English teacher attends a fairly large college or university, more than likely he will take a course in methods and techniques of English teaching. If he does, chances are that he will get another bit of instruction in measurement and evaluation. However, because of the limitations of time and because of the precedence that other concerns must receive in the methods course, naturally the attention given to measurement and evaluation is only slightly more than incidental, perhaps no more than a mere introduction to construction and use of classroom tests and the evaluation of student writing. Yet, in most cases, it is enough to give the student a little help.

Finally, if the prospective English teacher studies at a college or university of fair size, he will probably have an opportunity to elect a course in methods and techniques of teaching reading. If he chooses to take such a course,

chances are that he will receive a third bit of instruction in educational measurement and evaluation. But again, because of the pressures stemming from time limitations and other more urgent matters, the attention given to measurement and evaluation is sure to be somewhat incidental, probably touching only lightly upon diagnosis and remediation. Nevertheless, whatever it is, it will probably prove to be of some help to the student whenever he starts his teaching career.

Rare is the undergraduate program that provides the prospective teacher with a carefully planned sequence of learning experiences in educational measurement and evaluation, experiences that would give him at least a broad understanding of the basic principles of evaluation and test construction. Rarer still is the program that is sufficient to give the undergraduate a thorough understanding of the principles of evaluation and test construction. To accomplish the latter, a program would most likely have to require a full course in educational measurement and evaluation.

Knowing how to measure and evaluate learning is part and parcel of knowing how to teach: one does not exist without the other. It is essential, therefore, that the beginning teacher have broad knowledge and understanding of both when he enters his classroom that very first day. Knowledge of them is much too essential to permit the teacher time to learn them by the process of trial and error.

Naturally, by observing the testing practices and procedures of his high school and college instructors, the beginning teacher has absorbed some information about measurement and evaluation; no one would deny this. Yet, what he has learned in this way is not enough. Naturally, too, as he teaches from day to day, he will learn certain concepts and skills of measuring and evaluating the learning of his students; nor would any one deny this. But the point is that this learning does not occur soon enough, i.e., when he most needs it in the beginning days and months of his teaching career.

In Inservice Experiences and Programs for Teachers of English

As the beginning English teacher reads his students' compositions and book reports, as he listens to their acting out or oral reading of parts from Wilder's Our Town, as he overhears their informal use of language in the hallways, and as he constructs, administers, and grades tests and then discusses the scores and the test questions with his students--in all of these ways, he learns something to add to his gradually growing--but still inadequate--knowledge of educational measurement and evaluation. But that is not all he learns as he gains in experience.

Suppose the chairman of the English department or the guidance counselor asks him to help administer the Cooperative English Tests. If so, he will probably learn something about measurement and evaluation from that experience. Suppose, too, he bumps into a fellow English teacher in the teachers' lounge and they get to talking about a test that one or the other of them has just prepared. If so, he will probably learn from that experience, too. Suppose, again, that at one of the monthly faculty meetings the guidance counselor gives a report on the results of a recent administration of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) to the ninth-graders. If so, he will probably

learn from that experience, also. Suppose, finally, that he joins the National Council of Teachers of English, attends some of its annual conventions, reads the English Journal regularly, and even buys and reads Robert Carruthers' Building Better English Tests, Sister Judine's A Guide for Evaluating Student Composition, or Fred I. Godshalk's The Measurement of Writing Ability. If so, he will of course learn something about educational measurement and evaluation from those experiences, as well.

Though no right-thinking educator would ever discredit what teachers learn from their experiences in service, he also realizes that too often such learning does not occur in the depth desired, at the time desired, or at the pace desired. While it is true that a few school systems across the country have excellent in-service programs in measurement and evaluation, the number is extremely small and the programs are almost always geared to and conducted mainly for the guidance and counseling staff, not the teachers. In the final analysis, until or unless a teacher returns to a college or a university for graduate study, his chances of receiving additional formal training in educational measurement and evaluation are terribly slim.

Purposes and Objectives

As stated in Chapter I, this ISCPET Special Research Study was designed to (1) obtain information about the classroom practices and procedures and the level of competency in educational measurement and evaluation of experienced Illinois secondary school English teachers, grades seven through twelve, and (2) to attempt to determine, on the basis of the experienced teachers' judgments, the level of competency desirable for beginning secondary school English teachers with a bachelor's degree to possess. Underlying both of these objectives was the purpose of testing the validity of the competency in educational measurement and evaluation that ISCPET had recommended for beginning English teachers, namely, that they possess a "broad understanding of basic principles of evaluation and test construction in English."[1]

---

[1]"Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," College English, 27 (November, 1965), pp. 166-169.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Development and Use of "Questionnaire on Educational Measurement in English"

In order to accomplish the first major objective of this study, to obtain information about the classroom practices and procedures and the level of competency in educational measurement and evaluation of experienced Illinois secondary school English teachers (grades 7-12), the researchers prepared "Questionnaire on Educational Measurement in English" (Appendix A). This instrument consisted of thirty basic questions, two-thirds of which called for multiple responses, even up to thirty or more. Although it asked for the usual kinds of information from the teachers regarding their number of years of experience, class loads, number of daily preparations, grade levels of classes, school size, highest degree and year of conferral, and hours beyond that degree, it asked for much information that was more directly related to the primary objectives of this study. Specifically, it was designed to elicit from the teachers information as to the following: (1) amount of course work, if any, they had taken in educational measurement and evaluation and in educational psychology; (2) how, if not in formal courses, they had acquired their knowledge of educational measurement and evaluation; (3) whether they considered their knowledge of measurement and evaluation adequate for their needs as English teachers; (4) whether, in their opinions, prospective teachers of English should be required to have undergraduate training in measurement and evaluation; (5) the types of teacher-made tests questions they used in their classrooms, and the frequency of use; (6) other means of measurement they used, and the frequency of use; (7) the frequency with which they administered oral and written quizzes and tests in their classrooms; (8) whether they asked for criticism of their tests, and from whom (students, fellow teachers, etc.); (9) whether they made item analyses of their tests, and the frequency; (10) whether they discussed test results with their students, and, if so, the frequency; (11) whether they used test results in planning for instruction; (12) whether they developed and used grade-level tests in their schools and, if so, the occasions; (13) whether they used standardized English tests in their schools and, if so, the titles and the frequency of use; (14) what school personnel were involved in the selection and administration of standardized English tests, and in the interpretation of results; (15) whether the content of their English courses had in any way been influenced by the standardized tests used in their schools and, if so, how; (16) whether in their opinions, English teachers should alter their courses to bring them in line with college-admissions tests; and (17) to what degree they were familiar with thirty-two standardized English tests and with twenty-five standard publications on educational measurement and evaluation.

Use of "Checklist of Measurement Competencies"

The second major objective of this study was to attempt to determine, on the basis of experienced Illinois English teachers' judgments, the level of competency in educational measurement and evaluation which beginning secondary school English teachers should possess. Having heard at an ISCPET meeting in Chicago a report on the preliminary findings of Professor Samuel F. Mayo's USOE-sponsored research project on the preservice preparation of teachers in educational measurement, the researchers obtained the permission of Professor Mayo to use "Checklist of Measurement Competencies" (see Chapter IV, Results, and Appendix B), an instrument which he had designed for his project.

Professor Mayo had used the Checklist to find out the degrees of importance that experienced educators at a number of different levels and in many different positions or roles attached to the Checklist's seventy specific competencies proposed as desirable for beginning teachers to possess. In the present study, the Checklist was used for the same purposes, but only experienced English teachers in Illinois public and parochial secondary schools were invited to respond.

The seventy competencies included on the Checklist were grouped according to the following major content categories: Standardized Tests (10 items), Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests (13 items), Uses of Measurement and Evaluation (13 items), and Statistical Concepts (34 items). The respondents were instructed to rate, according to their opinions, the degree of importance of the seventy competency statements. The ratings on the scale were "Is Essential," "Is Desirable," "Is of Little Value," and "Do Not Understand Statement." The respondents were also asked to circle any part of a statement which was not clear to them.

The participants in this study were selected in September 1966, by a random-sampling process of the membership list of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English. As indicated earlier in this report, five hundred teachers were selected in this manner, and on October 3, 1966, the Questionnaire and the Checklist, along with a letter of invitation, were mailed to them.

Treatment of the Data

Of the 500 English teachers in the sample, 263 (52.60 percent) completed and returned the "Questionnaire on Educational Measurement in English" and the "Checklist of Measurement Competencies."

Tabulations were made of all responses to the Questionnaire, and percentages were obtained. For multiple-response questions, of course, the appropriate totals were used in obtaining the percentages.

Responses to the Checklist were tabulated using numerical values to represent the four ratings: "Is Essential" = 3; "Is Desirable" = 2; "Is of Little Importance" = 1; and "Do Not Understand Statement" = 0. Total mean ratings were then obtained for each statement, and sub-mean ratings were obtained for each of the four major categories of Standardized Tests, Construction and Evaluation of

Classroom Tests, Uses of Measurement and Evaluation, and Statistical Concepts. These means were obtained for each respondent, and were placed on IBM data cards with numerical representations of the highest degree held by the respondent, number of courses beyond that degree, number of courses in educational measurement and evaluation, and number of courses in educational psychology, English methods, or other professional educational courses which covered educational measurement and evaluation. These items just listed were considered as independent variables and the mean ratings were considered as dependent variables for the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation.

Frequencies and percentages were obtained of the mean ratings for each statement and for each of the four major categories. For these percentages, ranges were used as follows: "Essential" = 3.0 to 2.6; "Desirable" = 2.5 to 1.6; "Of Little Importance" = 1.5 to 1.0; "Do Not Understand" = .9 to .0.

A 1620 solid-state electronic computer was used for obtaining the means, the frequencies and percentages, and the correlations.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Analysis of the Questionnaire Data

By early January of 1967, 263 teachers had completed the Questionnaire and had reacted to the Checklist. Thus, results of this study are based on a return percentage of 52.60.

Caution should be exercised in generalizing on the results. The sample, as was stated above, included only experienced high school English teachers in Illinois, as represented by the membership of the IATE. Members of such organizations may be more professional-minded than most teachers.

Background Information

Examination of Table 1 indicates that the majority of the teachers responding teach in relatively small schools. The school with an enrollment of less than 500 is the one most represented by the respondents, with a percentage of 34.98. The median size, however, is 501-1,000.

The number of students met per class by the teachers in the study ranges from the interval of 3 to 5 to that of 39 to 41. A class size of 24 to 26 is the most usual size in the study, as shown by a percentage of 28.90. (See Table 2.)

Table 3 indicates that grades seven through thirteen are represented in the study. Fewer teachers of grades seven and eight are represented, and the majority of the teachers in the study teach grades eleven and twelve.

Examination of Table 4 indicates that perhaps half the respondents teach classes other than English and that few of the respondents have an extremely heavy load of six or seven English classes. However, 34.60 percent of the responding teachers do teach five English classes daily and 28.14 percent teach four classes. The Questionnaire did not ask for the names of other subjects taught.

The number of lesson preparations per day most represented is three, by 35.36 percent of the responding teachers. Table 5 indicates that 21.56 percent of the teachers have two lesson preparations per day. The range of preparations is from one to nine, but at the extremes the percentages are small.

Over half of the respondents (55.89%) in this study hold the master's degree; 42.21 percent hold the bachelor's degree as their highest degree. (See Table 6.)

TABLE 1

Enrollments of Schools Represented in the Study

Enrollment	N	Percent
0- 500	92	34.98
501- 1,000	63	23.95
1,001- 2,000	55	20.91
2,001- 3,000	32	12.08
3,001- 4,000	12	4.56
4,001- 5,000	6	2.28
5,001- 6,000	2	.76
...		
9,001-10,000	1	.38
TOTAL	263	99.90

TABLE 2

Number of Students per Class

Number of Students	N	Percent
...		
3- 5	1	.38
...		
12-14	2	.76
15-17	12	4.56
18-20	37	14.07
21-23	33	12.55
24-26	76	28.90
27-29	44	16.73
30-32	41	15.59
33-35	13	4.94
36-38	3	1.14
39-41	1	.38
TOTAL	263	100.00

TABLE 3

Grade Levels of Classes Taught

Grade Level	f	Percent of Responses
7	18	4.04
8	27	6.05
9	84	18.83
10	85	19.06
11	114	25.56
12	117	26.23
13	1	.22
TOTAL	446	99.99

TABLE 4

English Classes Taught per Day

Number of Classes	N	Percent
1	14	5.32
2	26	9.89
3	49	18.63
4	74	28.14
5	91	34.60
6	6	2.28
7	3	1.14
TOTAL	263	100.00

TABLE 5

Lesson Preparations per Day

Number of Preparations	N	Percent
1	26	9.89
2	83	31.56
3	93	35.36
4	28	10.65
5	21	7.98
6	8	3.04
7	2	.76
8	1	.38
9	1	.38
TOTAL	263	100.00

TABLE 6

Degrees Held by Responding Teachers

Degree	N	Percent
Two Year Diploma	1	.38
Bachelor's Degree	111	42.21
Master's Degree	147	55.89
Doctorate	3	1.14
None Indicated	1	.38
TOTAL	263	100.00

Table 7 reports the number of college semester credit hours earned beyond the highest degree in intervals of ten. After forty semester hours, the percentages drop considerably. The largest percentage of teachers, that of 37.64, reported having earned at least up to ten hours. Within this percentage, 40 of the teachers reported having earned no college credit hours beyond their highest degree, and 24 of these teachers hold the master's degree.

Tables 7A and 7B report information on the number of college semester credit hours earned beyond the bachelor's and master's degrees. For almost all intervals, the percentages are slightly higher for teachers who hold the master's degree.

Examination of Table 8B indicates that the majority of the teachers in the sample have taught ten years or less. Table 8A indicates that within this range of ten years, 16.73 percent of the teachers have taught from five to eight years. The next largest percentage (19.39) of the respondents have taught between nine and twelve years.

Table 8, reveals what most other status surveys on teaching experience find, i.e., that by far the majority of the respondents have taught less than twenty years, and that within that number of years, ten years or less of teaching experience is most represented.

Preparation in Educational Measurement

One hundred forty-three of the responding teachers (a percentage of 54.37) reported that they have had course work in educational measurement and evaluation, including the construction of tests and the use of tests and test results. Almost as many teachers (118, a percentage of 44.87) indicated that they have not had such training.

One question was designed specifically for respondents who indicated that they had not had course work in educational measurement and evaluation. The question asked them how they had learned about this subject. However, both teachers with and without course work *per se* in educational measurement and evaluation evidently responded to this portion of the Questionnaire. Table 9 indicates that 115 of the responding teachers had studied these topics in courses in educational psychology, 89 in English methods, and 46 in other professional education courses. Obviously, some of the teachers have had either two or even three courses, or parts of courses, which cover educational measurement and evaluation.

The Questionnaire asked the respondents to list the titles of their courses in which educational measurement and evaluation had been covered. Approximately 96 course titles were listed--titles ranging from broad topics such as "Statistics" to even more general topics such as "Recent Trends in Teaching." However, the most frequently occurring titles, in order, were: "Tests and Measurements," "Educational Psychology," "Educational Statistics," "Educational Measurement," and "Construction of Tests."

TABLE 7

College Credit Hours Earned beyond the Highest Degree

Credit Hours	N	Percent
0-10	99	37.64
11-20	57	21.67
21-30	40	15.21
31-40	35	13.31
41-50	20	7.60
51-60	7	2.66
61-70	1	.38
71-80	2	.76
No Indication	2	.76
TOTAL	263	99.99

TABLE 7A

College Credit Hours Earned
beyond the Bachelor's Degree

Credit Hours	N	Percent
0-10	42	37.83
11-20	24	21.62
21-30	22	19.81
31-40	13	11.71
41-50	7	6.30
51-60	2	1.80
61-70	1	.90
TOTAL	111	99.97

TABLE 7B

College Credit Hours Earned
beyond the Master's Degree

Credit Hours	N	Percent
0-10	54	36.73
11-20	33	22.45
21-30	18	12.24
31-40	23	15.64
41-50	14	9.52
51-60	3	2.04
61-70	0	-
71-80	2	1.37
TOTAL	147	99.99

TABLE 8

Number of Years of Teaching Experience
Represented by the Respondents

Table 8A: Four-Year Intervals

Number of Years	N	Percent
1- 4	38	14.45
5- 8	44	16.73
9-12	51	19.39
13-16	39	14.83
17-20	17	6.46
21-24	18	6.84
25-28	18	6.84
27-32	17	6.46
33-36	8	3.04
37-40	9	3.42
41-44	1	.38
45-48	2	.76
No Response	1	.38
TOTAL	263	99.98

Table 8B: Ten-Year Intervals

Number of Years	N	Percent
1-10	107	40.68
11-20	81	30.80
21-30	48	18.25
31-40	24	9.13
41-50	2	.76
No Response	1	.38
TOTAL	263	100.00

Table 8C: Twenty-Five-Year Intervals

Number of Years	N	Percent
1-25	212	80.61
26-50	50	19.01
No Response	1	.38
TOTAL	263	100.00

TABLE 9

Types and Frequencies of Measurement Courses or Courses Involving Measurement Taken by Teachers in the Study

Course Description	f	Percent
Educational Measurement and Evaluation	143	36.39
Educational Psychology, English Methods, or Other Professional Education Courses	115 89 46	29.26 22.65 11.70
TOTAL	393	100.00

TABLE 10

Source of Knowledge of Educational Measurement and Evaluation

Source	f	Percent of Responses
Reading of Professional Articles and Books	143	20.55
Student Teaching Experience	87	12.50
Actual Classroom Experience	155	22.27
Assisting in Administering Tests	68	9.77
Informal Conversations with Other Faculty	123	17.67
Inservice Meetings, Workshops, Institutes	106	15.23
Other Sources	14	2.01
TOTAL	696	100.00

The question designed for the respondent who had indicated no course work in educational measurement and evaluation also asked him to indicate how he had learned of these topics in ways other than in formal courses. This question was supplied with several responses as well as with an "open end" for individual comments.

Table 10 indicates that the three most popular places for learning of educational measurement and evaluation, for this sample at any rate, are classroom experience, professional reading, and informal conversations with other faculty members. The "other sources" listed in Table 10 were, for the most part, practical and applied experience with testing.

Adequacy of Preparation in Educational Measurement

One hundred sixty-eight of the responding teachers, a percentage of 63.89, believe that their present knowledge of educational measurement and evaluation is sufficient for their needs as English teachers. However, 95, or 36.11 percent, of the teachers feel their knowledge is inadequate. Many of the comments which were made by the respondents on this item indicate that the lack is general, in that English teachers feel they must never stop learning, they should constantly remain abreast of new findings and developments in their field, and they should always be looking for fresh and new approaches. Other comments indicate specific areas of weakness existing in ability to select appropriate tests, ability to interpret test results, ability to construct tests, and ability to determine what is measurable in English. A sampling of the personal comments follows.

> As I looked through this questionnaire, I realized how much I didn't know. While I have been able to gain competency in tests and measurements through practical experience, a course in this area would have eliminated much "trial and error" on my part in test construction.
>
> I feel that I could use several courses in educational measurement and evaluation.
>
> I am never through learning. I study all the time. I seek knowledge of testing in English through publications for teachers and through college preparatory courses offered for high school students, as well as in workshops.
>
> Knowledge is inadequate in area of measuring and evaluating creative compositions (and some expository compositions) of students.
>
> I feel that almost all teachers in the educational system need to know more of their own objectives in education; also, I feel we are too archaic in many methods of instruction and testing.
>
> I am still quite insecure about the types of tests which are best to give at various levels. I am discouraged at times with test results; I would like to know if the weakness lies in my teaching or my testing.
>
> I think everyone needs to know more about this and that you need more than just adequate knowledge.
>
> It is now; but it took me a few years to be able to grade essay tests and analytical compositions without seriously questioning my decision on each paper.

I feel inadequate in composition objective tests. I also feel inadequate in phrasing essay tests so as to allow a certain amount of creative thinking.

I have never learned to use any standards for evaluating written work nor have I ever been acquainted with much training in preparing English tests in literature which would tend to point out in subtle ways certain valuable points.

I need to be able to gauge the differences that exist between levels of capability--otherwise, what is fair to ask the slow student, the average student, and the exceptional student.

As I continue to move away from using a single textbook, and rely more on teaching concepts, I find I need to construct my own tests more and more. Using many sources instead of one or two, I often feel inadequate in preparing a test that tests what I want it to test.

Desirable Preparation in Educational Measurement

By far the majority of the teachers in the study believe that a prospective secondary school English teacher should have as a portion of his undergraduate requirements preparation in educational measurement and evaluation. Although 34 of the teachers (12.93%) think that such preparation should not be required and although 42 (15.96%) of the teachers are undecided, 183, a percentage of 69.58, believe such preparation should be a requirement. Four of the teachers omitted the question. Comments which were made in support of this response indicate that English teachers need to know at least the basic concepts and terminology of educational measurement and evaluation in order to prepare their lessons, revise their presentations, construct and evaluate tests, prepare evaluations, assist students in self-evaluation, understand and appreciate standardized tests, as well as read and understand research in English. A few of the representative comments are given here.

Too few teachers know how to pre-test and post-test their class membership in order to evaluate planning and to avoid repetitious teaching. Too many teachers can't use standardized test results to modify teaching patterns.

I believe that all teachers should have such training with emphasis on test purposes and analysis for individuals rather than comparison and threatening instruments toward students.

It is wonderful to have at least a background course on which you can depend in time of need. If you have a basic knowledge of the needed facts you can proceed from there with the help of other teachers, books, or reference materials. Personally, I think every good test has the needed instructions and directions for measurement and evaluation.

Beginning teachers value the security of testing "know-how." Those who launch into teaching without previous test and measurement involvement are unhappy and must resort to files of old tests and colleagues for assistance. I heartily endorse solid courses in educational measurement.

Especially in the future, the English teacher should be able to read some degree of research, properly understanding the terminology as he or she does so. Most important to me in the test and measurement course I took was the philosophy involved, what all might affect a student's test performance, what "average scores" don't show, etc.

There should be more practical application of the principles involved. Too much time elapses between presentation of the theoretical principles and perception of the applicability to individuals, classes, and schools.

I think a course in measurement and evaluation could help teachers feel more adequate and would give them a scientific means of determining accuracy, validity, and reliability in their testing program.

My own undergraduate courses were very thorough. I feel I gained considerable awareness of the functions, possibilities, and limitations of measurement and evaluation. Furthermore, although I actually use only a minor part of this in the classroom, the knowledge is invaluable in the counseling aspect of teaching.

Perhaps a course of this kind would be helpful in administering diagnostic tests and understanding results, as well as in giving objective-type tests. However, in English, essay questions seem more appropriate than objective type and there were few comments (in the course I took) on essay type tests.

Prospective teachers of English need background enriching courses. Such courses could expand the teachers' area of awareness and lead them to perceive that each student needs to move towards an essential realization--the realization that all answers lie within himself. Perceiving this, teachers continue to grow. They develop adeptness at responding to and in creating situations wherein students can become (1) increasingly effective in the communicating of spoken, read, or written words (2) genuinely appreciative of noble ideas beautifully expressed, and (3) really capable of thinking independently and in depth.

As a result of having been a member of the Committee of Examiners in English for the College Entrance Examination Board, I am aware of the skill required to write test items. I am also aware of the need of teachers of English to understand how to construct a variety of test items that test what is important in the teaching of English.

Testing and Evaluating Practices of English Teachers

The data summarized in Table 11 indicate that the English teachers in the sample construct and use most often essay and short-answer examinations.

The data of Table 12 support the findings of Table 11. The respondents reported that the "theme" is the most frequently used means of measurement, with "cumulative writing folders" and "informal diagnostic questioning" also being used. Respondents indicated that as means of testing they use "written reports on individual reading" fairly frequently and "oral reports on individual reading" only occasionally. "Handwriting scales" as a means of testing and evaluating is the least popular with the responding teachers, being used rarely or never.

Table 13 indicates that written or oral quizzes are most often given on a weekly basis in the English classroom. The findings of Tables 11 and 12 indicate that the majority of these quizzes are most likely to be written ones.

Two hundred and six of the teachers, a percentage of 78.33, reported that they seek criticism of their tests. A percentage of 20.15, representing 53 of the teachers, indicated that they do not solicit criticism. Table 14 shows the persons from whom this criticism is sought and the percentages of the teachers seeking that criticism. Multiple responses were permitted, and the data in Table 14 indicate that the most popular source of criticism is that of students themselves. Fellow teachers are a prime source, as well. This finding correlates with the earlier finding that fellow teachers serve as a good source of information about measurement and evaluation in general.

Many of the teachers in the study--222 (a percentage of 84.41)--indicated that they perform an item analysis of their tests in order to find out why students answered questions right or wrong. Fifty-one (19.39%) of the teachers do this "always," 80 (30.42%) do it "frequently," and 69 (26.24%) do this as an "occasional" practice.

All teachers reported that after returning tests to their students, they usually discuss the results with them. Of the teachers responding, 205 (77.95%) reported that this is an "always" teaching practice, 50 (19.01%) said they do this "frequently," and only 2 (.76%) reported this as an "occasional" practice. One teacher admitted that he "rarely" (about once a year) discusses tests and test results with his students.

TABLE 11

Types of Teacher-Made Tests and Frequency of Use

	Frequently		Fairly Freq.		Occasionally		Rarely		Never	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
True-False	26	9.35	76	10.89	52	18.71	36	25.00	46	40.00
Multiple Choice	23	8.27	122	17.48	62	22.30	34	23.61	18	15.65
Matching	18	6.47	118	16.91	69	24.82	33	22.92	23	20.00
Completion	32	11.51	115	16.48	56	20.14	32	22.22	22	19.13
Short Answer	78	28.06	138	19.77	26	9.35	5	3.47	3	2.61
Essay	101	36.33	129	18.47	13	4.68	4	2.78	3	2.61
Total	278	99.99	698	100.00	278	100.00	144	100.00	115	100.00

TABLE 12

Other Means of Measurement and Frequency of Use

	Frequently (weekly)		Fairly Frequently (once per 6 weeks)		Occasionally (once per semester)		Rarely (yearly)		Never		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
a. Reading interest inventories	7	1.22	37	3.38	49	5.44	143	6.84	6	5.66	242	5.08
b. Cumulative reading records	16	2.80	93	8.50	46	5.11	89	4.26	6	5.66	250	5.25
c. Oral reports on individual reading	10	1.75	97	8.87	102	11.33	69	3.30	1	.94	279	5.86
d. Written reports on individual reading	23	4.02	164	14.99	52	5.78	31	1.48	1	.94	271	5.69
e. Conferences with individual students	29	5.07	96	8.78	91	10.11	54	2.58	3	2.83	273	5.73
f. Cumulative writing folders	77	13.46	76	6.95	34	3.77	65	3.11	5	4.72	257	5.40
g. Informal diagnostic questioning	75	13.11	70	6.40	47	5.22	65	3.11	1	.94	258	5.42
h. Anecdotal records	5	.87	12	1.10	34	3.77	184	8.80	9	8.49	244	5.12
i. Tape recordings of students' speech	5	.87	14	1.28	41	4.56	168	8.03	9	8.49	237	4.98
j. Observation of students' use of language in social situations	49	8.56	60	5.48	63	7.00	76	3.63	3	2.83	251	5.27
k. Evaluation checklists designed for a variety of situations	13	2.27	34	3.10	49	5.44	131	6.27	10	9.43	237	4.98
l. Students' individual cumulative lists of spelling errors	40	6.99	52	4.75	40	4.44	111	5.31	5	4.72	248	5.21
m. Class notebooks	37	6.47	53	4.84	46	5.11	110	5.26	6	5.66	252	5.29
n. Term papers	9	1.57	13	1.19	50	5.56	162	7.75	5	4.72	239	5.02
o. Handwriting scales	4	.70	8	.73	14	1.56	198	9.47	17	16.04	241	5.06
p. Attitude scales	2	.35	24	2.19	19	2.11	181	8.66	8	7.55	234	4.91
q. Student self-evaluation	17	2.97	40	3.66	60	6.67	130	6.22	7	6.60	254	5.33
r. Peer appraisal	17	2.97	54	4.94	56	6.22	117	5.60	3	2.83	247	5.19
s. Themes	137	23.95	97	8.87	7	.78	7	.33	1	.94	249	5.23
t. Other means	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Total	572	99.97	1094	100.00	900	99.98	2091	100.01	106	99.99	4763	100.02

TABLE 13

Frequency of Occurrence of Written or Oral Quizzes

	f	%
Daily	32	10.16
Weekly	190	60.32
Once each 3 weeks	65	20.63
Once each 6 weeks	11	3.49
Once each semester	17	5.40
Total	315	100.00

TABLE 14

Source and Frequency of Test Criticism Sought by Teachers in the Study

Source	f	%
Students	186	44.71
Fellow teachers	144	34.62
Department head	50	12.02
Guidance counselor	17	4.09
Principal	17	4.09
Other	2	.47
Total	416	100.00

TABLE 15

Source and Frequency of Selection, Administration, and Interpretation of Standardized English Tests

	Selection		Adm.		Interp.		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
a. Individual teachers	6	6.25	36	32.73	31	29.25	73	23.40
b. Individual teachers with assistance from dept. head	9	9.38	10	9.09	11	10.38	30	9.62
c. Individual teachers with assistance from guidance counselor	8	8.33	14	12.73	16	15.09	38	12.18
d. Individual teachers with assistance from dept. head and guidance counselor	5	5.21	5	4.55	11	10.38	21	6.73
e. A committee of teachers	4	4.17	1	.90	1	.94	6	1.92
f. A committee assisted by dept. head	9	9.38	3	2.73	1	.94	13	4.17
g. A committee assisted by guidance counselor	5	5.21	7	6.36	4	3.77	16	5.13
h. A committee assisted by dept. head and guidance counselor	8	8.33	0	-	2	1.89	10	3.21
i. All members of department	3	3.13	3	2.73	3	2.83	9	2.88
j. All members of dept. with assistance from guidance counselor	1	1.04	5	4.55	3	2.83	9	2.88
k. The department head	11	11.45	4	3.63	6	5.66	21	6.73
l. Guidance counselor	27	28.12	22	20.00	17	16.04	66	21.15
Total	96	100.00	110	100.00	106	100.00	312	100.00

Use of Standardized Tests in English

Almost half of the responding teachers (111, a percentage of 42.21) reported that a standardized English test is administered in their schools on a regular basis, and 142 (53.99%) of the teachers indicated that this is not a practice in their schools. Table 15 reports the source and frequency of selection, administration, and interpretation of the standardized English tests which are used in the schools represented in the study.

The prime source of selection appears to be the guidance counselor, but it is the individual teacher who most often administers the tests. Interpretation of the results of the tests appears to be somewhat a shared responsibility of teachers and the guidance counselor, but in the majority of cases individual teachers do this.

Eighty-six (32.70%) of the teachers reported that the content of their courses has been influenced by standardized tests given in their schools, and 122 (46.39%) reported no such influence. A percentage of 41.06 (108 teachers) reported that they believe courses should be altered so as to be in line with college admissions tests and other standardized tests, but 106 teachers, a percentage of 40.30, do not hold such a belief.

Table 16 reports frequencies and percentages of the degrees of familiarity with various standardized high school English tests. The test reported to have the most use by the teachers in this study is the Center-Durost Literature Acquaintance Test, and the test reported by most to have never been heard of is the ITED: Test 3, Correctness and Appropriateness of Expression. The test receiving the most votes for "recognize the title only" is the CEEB Writing Sample.

Familiarity with Standard Publications on Educational Measurement and Evaluation

Table 17 reports the frequencies and percentages of responses on the degree of familiarity with twenty-four publications on educational measurement and evaluation. The publication read and used most often is Herschel T. Manuel's Elementary Statistics for Teachers. The book rating second in this category is Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain.

TABLE 16

Degree of Familiarity with Various Standardized English Tests

	Used Test		Examined Test But Never Used		Know Test But Never Used		Recognize Title		Never Heard of Test		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
a. CEEB Advanced Placement Exam: English	8	.23	71	4.00	74	6.21	52	7.73	34	3.70	239	2.19
b. Cooperative English Test: Usage, Spelling, and Vocabulary	111	3.25	48	2.70	33	2.77	19	2.82	38	4.14	249	3.12
c. Cooperative English Tests (1960 Revision)	121	3.55	52	2.93	31	2.60	18	2.67	26	2.83	248	3.11
d. Essentials of English Tests (Revised Edition)	145	4.25	50	2.82	28	2.34	12	1.78	19	2.07	254	3.19
e. ITED: Test 3, Correctness and Appropriateness of Expression	37	1.08	64	3.61	40	3.36	31	4.61	65	7.08	237	2.97
f. Metropolitan Achievement Tests: Advanced Battery (Grades 7-9)	97	2.84	64	3.61	44	3.69	24	3.57	36	3.92	265	3.32
g. Metropolitan Achievement Tests: High School Language Tests	101	2.96	70	3.94	42	3.52	23	3.42	20	2.19	256	3.21
h. The Purdue High School English Test	139	4.08	57	3.21	27	2.26	14	2.08	19	2.07	256	3.21
i. SRA Achievement Series: Language Arts	33	.97	84	4.73	56	4.70	40	5.94	48	5.23	261	3.27
j. Stanford Achievement Test: Spelling and Language	31	.91	71	4.00	84	7.05	30	4.46	44	4.80	260	3.26
k. CEEB Writing Sample	31	.91	61	3.44	65	5.45	53	7.88	40	4.36	250	3.14
l. STEP: Essay Test	99	2.90	57	3.21	45	3.78	34	5.05	17	1.85	252	3.16
m. STEP: Writing	109	3.20	54	3.04	34	2.85	18	2.67	27	2.94	242	3.04
n. Gates Reading Survey	90	2.64	57	3.21	37	3.10	19	2.82	45	4.90	248	3.11
o. Iowa Silent Reading Tests: New Ed.	64	1.88	60	3.38	55	4.61	27	4.02	42	4.57	248	3.11
p. Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Reading)	106	3.11	57	3.21	37	3.10	20	2.97	28	3.05	248	3.11
q. The Nelson-Denny Reading Test: Vocabulary-Comprehension Rate	130	3.81	39	2.20	31	2.60	16	2.38	29	3.16	245	3.07
r. Reading Comprehension: Cooperative English Tests	111	3.25	63	3.55	31	2.60	22	3.27	30	3.27	257	3.22
s. SRA Achievement Series: Reading	31	.91	79	4.45	52	4.36	30	4.46	64	6.97	256	3.21
t. STEP: Reading	107	3.14	66	3.72	34	2.85	20	2.97	22	2.40	249	3.12
u. Stanford Achievement Test: (Reading Tests)	37	1.08	76	4.28	59	4.95	35	5.20	41	4.47	248	3.11
v. Diagnostic Reading Scales	104	3.05	67	3.77	37	3.10	16	2.38	19	2.07	243	3.05
w. Diagnostic Reading Tests	98	2.87	63	3.55	38	3.19	15	2.23	29	3.16	243	3.05
x. ITED: Test 7, Ability to Interpret Literary Materials	193	5.66	28	1.58	12	1.01	6	.89	5	.54	244	3.06
y. Barrett-Ryan Literature Test	70	2.05	64	3.61	42	3.52	22	3.27	48	5.23	246	3.09
z. Center-Durost Literature Acquaintance Test	226	6.63	18	1.01	6	.50	3	.46	3	.33	256	3.21
aa. Cooperative Literary Comprehension and Appreciation Test	187	5.48	29	1.63	12	1.01	5	.74	8	.87	241	3.02
bb. The New Iowa Spelling Scale	166	4.87	43	2.42	20	1.68	10	1.48	3	.33	242	3.04
cc. Traxler High School Spelling Test	179	5.25	49	2.76	22	1.85	9	1.34	5	.54	264	3.31
dd. Cooperative Vocabulary Test	168	4.93	39	2.20	15	1.26	8	1.19	10	1.09	240	3.01
ee. Durost-Center Word Mastery Test: Evaluation and Adjustment Series	203	5.95	25	1.41	8	.67	3	.46	1	.11	240	3.01
ff. ITED: Test 8, General Vocabulary	78	2.29	50	2.82	41	3.44	19	2.82	52	5.66	240	3.01
gg. Other standardized English tests	1	.03	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	.11	2	.03
TOTAL	3411	100.01	1775	100.00	1192	99.98	673	100.03	918	100.01	7969	99.14

TABLE 17

Degree of Familiarity with Various Publications on Educational Measurement and Evaluation

	Have Read and Used		Familiar With		Only General Knowledge of		Only Recognize Title		Have Heard of		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
a. Adams, Georgia. Measurement and Evaluation for the Secondary School Teacher.	181	4.37	38	4.61	18	3.79	8	3.31	2	.64	247	4.12
b. Ahmann and Glock. Evaluating Pupil Growth.	177	4.28	33	4.01	24	5.05	7	2.89	5	1.59	246	4.10
c. Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.) The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain.	191	4.61	19	2.31	18	3.79	9	3.72	16	5.10	253	4.22
d. Bauernfeind, R. H. Building a School Testing Program.	188	4.54	41	4.98	17	3.58	7	2.89	4	1.27	257	4.29
e. Buros, O. K. The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook.	153	3.70	30	3.64	13	2.74	18	7.44	37	11.78	251	4.19
f. Buros, O. K. Tests in Print.	150	3.62	30	3.64	28	5.89	14	5.79	31	9.87	253	4.22
g. Carruthers, Robert. Building Better English Tests.	124	2.96	41	4.98	42	8.84	17	7.02	27	8.60	251	4.19
h. Durost, Walter N.; and Prescott, George A. Essentials of Measurement for Teachers.	177	4.28	39	4.73	18	3.79	9	3.72	5	1.59	248	4.14
i. Garrett, Henry E. Testing for Teachers.	181	4.37	39	4.73	19	4.00	8	3.31	5	1.59	252	4.20
j. Gerberich, Joseph Raymond. Measurement and Evaluation in the Modern School.	195	4.71	35	4.25	14	2.95	9	3.72	4	1.27	257	4.29
k. Gerberich, J. Raymond. Specimen Objective Test Items: A Guide to Achievement Test Construction.	186	4.49	30	3.64	18	3.79	5	2.07	9	2.87	248	4.14
l. Gronlund, Norman E. Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching.	171	4.13	36	4.37	18	3.79	15	6.20	4	1.27	244	4.07
m. Green, John A. Teacher-Made Tests.	172	4.15	31	3.76	24	5.05	9	3.72	11	3.50	247	4.12
n. Harris, Chester W. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research.	146	3.53	35	4.25	21	4.42	18	7.44	31	9.87	251	4.19
o. Krathwohl, David R.; Bloom, Benjamin S.; and Masia, Bertram B. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Handbook II: Affective Domain.	196	4.73	24	2.91	11	2.32	4	1.65	12	3.82	247	4.12
p. Lindquist, E. F. Educational Measurement.	145	3.50	49	5.95	24	5.05	12	4.96	21	6.69	251	4.19
q. Manuel, Herschel T. Elementary Statistics for Teachers.	204	4.93	25	3.03	11	2.32	4	1.65	4	1.27	248	4.14
r. Noll, Victor H. Introduction to Educational Measurement.	186	4.50	34	4.13	17	3.58	5	2.07	3	.96	245	4.09
s. Smith, Fred M.; and Adams, Sam. Educational Measurement for the Classroom Teacher.	191	4.61	30	3.64	17	3.58	9	3.72	3	.96	250	4.17
t. Stanley, Julian C. Measurement in Today's Schools.	185	4.47	36	4.37	17	3.58	6	2.48	4	1.27	248	4.14
u. Thorndike, Robert L.; and Hagen, Elizabeth. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education.	120	2.90	49	5.95	28	5.89	19	7.85	36	11.46	252	4.20
v. Travers, Robert M. W. How to Make Achievement Tests.	174	4.20	34	4.13	18	3.79	11	4.55	14	4.46	251	4.19
w. Traxler, Arthur E.; Jacobs, Robert; Selover, Margaret I.; and Townsend, Agatha. Introduction to Testing and the Use of Test Results in Public Schools.	150	3.62	40	4.85	26	5.47	11	4.55	19	6.05	246	4.10
x. Wood, Dorothy Adkins. Test Construction.	186	4.49	26	3.16	14	2.95	8	3.31	7	2.23	241	4.02
y. Others*	11	.27	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	.18
TOTAL	4140	99.96	824	100.02	475	100.00	242	100.03	314	99.98	5995	100.02

Analysis of the Checklist Data

Table 18 summarizes the data of the respondents' reactions to the seventy items on the Checklist of Measurement Competencies. For the Checklist, as previously explained, the teachers were asked to rate each of the seventy statements on measurement as "Is Essential," "Is Desirable," or "Is of Little Importance" for a beginning high school English teacher with a bachelor's degree. A rating of "Do Not Understand Statement" was also available. Each of these ratings was equated with a numerical value as follows: "Essential" = 3; "Desirable" = 2; "Of Little Importance" = 1; and "Do Not Understand" = 0. Mean ratings were then obtained of these numerical values. For Table 18, frequencies and percentages were obtained of mean ratings which fell within selected ranges. For example, a range of 3.0 to 2.6 was considered to constitute the rating of "Essential," 2.5 to 1.6, "Desirable," and so forth.

The major category of Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests is the category considered by the respondents to be of the most importance to beginning teachers of English. Of the teachers responding, 29.65 percent consider this category of competencies "Essential," and 67.68 percent rate it "Desirable." The second most important category of competencies is Standardized Tests, with 19.39 percent of the teachers rating it "Essential" and 76.04 percent indicating that it is "Desirable." Of almost equal ranking for the second most important category of competencies is Uses of Measurement and Evaluation. Here, 18.63 percent of the teachers rate it "Essential" and 73.00 percent rate it "Desirable."

Almost half of the teachers responding (47.52%) consider the competencies in the category of Statistical Concepts to be "Of Little Importance" to the beginning teacher of English. However, 38.78 percent of the respondents do consider the competencies in this category as "Desirable." It is interesting to note that it is this category for which the largest percentage of teachers (11.40) selected the option "Do Not Understand."

TABLE 18

Frequencies and Percentages of Mean Ratings
for the Major Categories of the Checklist

Major Categories	Ranges of Mean Evaluation									
	Essential 3.0-2.6		Desirable 2.5-1.6		Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0		Do Not Understand .9-0		TOTALS	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Standardized Tests	51	19.39	200	76.04	10	3.80	2	.76	263	99.99
Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests	78	29.65	178	67.68	5	1.90	2	.76	263	99.99
Uses of Measurement and Evaluation	49	18.63	192	73.00	16	6.08	6	2.28	263	99.99
Statistical Concepts	6	2.28	102	38.78	125	47.52	30	11.40	263	99.98

Table 19 summarizes the number of statements falling within each of the ranges previously mentioned, and Table 20 reveals that the range of mean ratings is from 2.79 to .67.

Table 20 also reports the percentages of ratings and the mean ratings for each statement on the Checklist. It should be recalled that the greater the numerical value of the mean rating, the more important the statement is considered to be by the respondents.

TABLE 19

Frequency Distribution of Ratings by Major Categories of the Checklist

Major Categories and Item Numbers	Essential 3.0-2.6	Desirable 2.5-1.6	Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0	Do Not Understand .9-.0	TOTAL
Standardized Tests (Statements 1-10)	1	8	1	0	10
Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests (11-23)	6	6	0	1	13
Uses of Measurement and Evaluation (24-36)	0	13	0	0	13
Statistical Concepts (37-70)	0	13	17	4	34
TOTALS	7	40	18	5	70

Standardized Tests

Under the major category of Standardized Tests, only one item (No.4), is considered "Essential." This item reads "Understanding of the importance of adhering strictly to the directions and stated time limits of standardized tests." This statement received the highest mean rating of the ten statements in this category, 2.76. With this mean rating, 78.32 percent of the respondents considered the statement as "Essential." Eight items (numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10) are considered "Desirable" for beginning English teachers to know. These items relate to sources and general uses of intelligence, achievement, and aptitude tests and of personality inventories. Only Item 9 was rated "Of Little Importance."

Item 9, "Familiarity with need for and application of projective techniques," received the lowest mean rating within the category. The low mean rating of 1.26 is due primarily to 29.65 percent of the teachers selecting the valueless option of "Do Not Understand," and perhaps for this reason should not be considered technically as one for the "Of Little Importance" rating. The one statement considered "Desirable," by 60.07 percent of the teachers in the study (with a mean rating of 2.19), in this category is "Knowledge of general information about intelligence and aptitude tests."

TABLE 20

Frequencies and Percentages of Ratings and Overall Mean Rating of the Seventy Statements on the Checklist

	Essential 3.0-2.6		Desirable 2.5-1.6		Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0		Do Not Understand .9-.0		No Response		Mean Rating
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
STANDARDIZED TESTS											
1. Knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of standardized tests.	128	48.66	127	48.28	6	2.28	---	---	2	.76	2.46
2. Ability to compare standardized with teacher-made tests and choose appropriately in a local situation.	109	41.44	136	51.71	16	6.08	---	---	2	.76	2.35
3. Ability to interpret achievement test scores.	143	54.37	111	42.20	6	2.28	---	---	3	1.14	2.52
4. Understanding of the importance of adhering strictly to the directions and stated time limits of standardized tests.	206	78.32	49	18.63	6	2.28	---	---	2	.76	2.76
5. Knowledge of sources of information about standardized tests.	62	23.57	156	59.31	40	15.20	1	.38	4	1.52	2.07
6. Knowledge of general information about group intelligence tests.	81	30.79	150	57.03	28	10.64	1	.38	3	1.14	2.19
7. Knowledge of general information about individual intelligence and aptitude tests.	76	28.89	158	60.07	22	8.36	2	.76	5	1.90	2.19
8. Familiarity with need for and application of personality and interest inventories.	33	12.54	147	55.89	75	28.51	3	1.14	5	1.90	1.81
9. Familiarity with need for and application of projective techniques.	22	8.36	100	38.02	50	19.01	78	29.65	13	4.94	1.26
10. Knowledge of general uses of tests, such as motivating, emphasizing important teaching objectives in the minds of pupils, providing practice in skill, and guiding learning.	167	63.49	79	30.03	10	3.95	3	1.14	4	1.52	2.58
CONSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM TESTS											
11. Knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of teacher-made tests.	186	70.72	72	27.37	3	1.14	---	---	2	.76	2.70
12. Knowledge of the fact that test items should be constructed in terms of both content and behavior.	105	39.92	77	29.27	7	2.66	69	26.23	5	1.90	1.84
13. Ability to state measurable educational objectives.	132	50.19	102	38.78	16	6.08	8	3.04	5	1.90	2.38

TABLE 20--Continued

	Essential 3.0-2.6		Desirable 2.5-1.6		Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0		Do Not Understand .9-.0		No Response		Mean Rating
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
14. Knowledge of the general principles of test construction (e.g., planning the test, preparing the test and evaluating the test).	209	79.46	48	18.25	3	1.14	---	---	3	1.14	2.79
15. Knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of various types of objective test items.	167	63.49	89	33.84	3	1.14	---	---	4	1.52	2.63
16. Knowledge of the techniques of administering a test.	158	60.07	96	36.50	5	1.90	1	.38	3	1.14	2.58
17. Ability to construct different types of test items.	189	71.86	64	24.33	8	3.04	---	---	2	.76	2.69
18. Understanding and application of correction-for-guessing formula to an objective test.	47	17.87	130	49.42	51	19.39	27	10.26	8	3.04	1.77
19. Knowledge of the principles involved in scoring subjective and objective tests.	143	54.37	106	40.30	6	2.28	3	1.14	5	1.90	2.50
20. Knowledge of effective procedures in reporting to parents.	140	53.23	104	39.54	11	4.18	3	1.14	5	1.90	2.47
21. Knowledge of effective marking procedures.	190	72.24	60	22.81	4	1.52	5	1.90	4	1.52	2.67
22. Knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of essay questions.	204	77.56	50	19.01	2	.76	1	.38	6	2.28	2.77
23. Familiarity with the blueprint scheme for dealing with the content and behavior dimensions in test planning.	12	4.56	62	23.57	31	11.78	151	57.41	7	2.66	.74
USES OF MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION											
24. Ability to interpret diagnostic test results so as to evaluate pupil progress.	132	50.19	116	44.10	10	3.80	---	---	5	1.90	2.47
25. Ability to interpret the ratio formula relating CA, MA and IQ.	68	25.85	122	46.38	47	17.87	20	7.60	6	2.28	1.92
26. Familiarity with expected academic behavior of students classified in certain IQ ranges.	124	47.14	112	42.58	18	6.84	5	1.90	4	1.52	2.37
27. Ability to interpret a profile of sub-test results of standardized tests.	48	18.25	124	47.14	51	19.39	32	12.16	8	3.04	1.73
28. Knowledge of limitations of tests that require reading comprehension.	128	48.66	118	44.86	11	4.18	2	.76	4	1.52	2.43
29. Understanding of the limitations of the "percentage" system of marking.	123	46.76	116	44.10	17	6.46	3	1.14	4	1.52	2.38

TABLE 20--Continued

	Essential 3.0-2.6		Desirable 2.5-1.6		Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0		Do Not Understand .9-0		No Response		Mean Rating
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
30. Understanding of the limitations of applying national norms to a local situation.	108	41.06	124	47.14	26	9.88	1	.38	4	1.52	2.30
31. Ability to compare two classes on the basis of the means and standard deviations of a test.	48	18.25	148	56.27	59	22.43	4	1.52	4	1.52	1.92
32. Knowledge of concepts of validity, reliability and item analysis.	72	27.37	150	57.03	28	10.64	6	2.28	7	2.66	2.12
33. Ability to do a simple item analysis for a teacher-made test.	98	37.26	144	54.75	8	3.04	9	3.42	4	1.52	2.27
34. Knowledge of the limitations of ability grouping based on only one measure of ability.	128	48.66	112	42.58	11	4.18	7	2.66	5	1.90	2.39
35. Knowledge of limitations in interpreting IQ scores.	151	57.41	97	36.88	10	3.80	---	---	5	1.90	2.54
36. Familiarity with the nature and uses of a frequency distribution.	49	18.63	132	50.19	52	19.77	26	9.88	4	1.52	1.78
STATISTICAL CONCEPTS											
37. Familiarity with techniques of ranking a set of scores.	69	26.23	151	57.41	32	12.16	7	2.66	4	1.52	2.08
38. Ability to set up class intervals for a frequency distribution.	38	14.44	111	42.20	61	23.19	49	18.63	4	1.52	1.53
39. Understanding of the basic concept of the standard error of measurement.	30	11.40	133	50.57	55	20.91	39	14.89	6	2.28	1.59
40. Understanding of the nature and uses of the histogram and frequency polygon.	2	.76	55	20.91	78	29.65	123	46.76	5	1.90	.75
41. Understanding of the nature and uses of the mode, median, and mean.	59	22.43	151	57.41	33	12.54	15	5.70	5	1.90	1.98
42. Ability to compute the mode, median and mean for simple sets of data.	48	18.25	137	52.09	58	22.05	15	5.70	5	1.90	1.84
43. Knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of the mode, median and mean.	53	20.15	149	56.65	40	15.20	15	5.70	6	2.28	1.93
44. Understanding of the meaning of the term "variability" and its connection with such terms as "scatter," "dispersion," "deviation," "homogeneity" and "heterogeneity."	29	11.02	112	42.58	76	28.89	41	15.58	5	1.90	1.50
45. Understanding of the nature and uses of the semi-interquartile range.	2	.76	56	21.29	78	29.65	122	46.38	5	1.90	.75

TABLE 20--Continued

	Essential 3.0-2.6		Desirable 2.5-1.6		Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0		Do Not Understand .9-0		No Response		Mean Rating
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
46. Understanding of the nature and uses of the standard deviation.	24	9.12	150	57.03	63	23.95	21	7.98	5	1.90	1.68
47. Ability to compute the semi-interquartile range for simple sets of data.	3	1.14	53	20.15	94	35.74	107	40.68	6	2.28	.81
48. Knowledge of the approximate percentile ranks associated with standard scores along the horizontal baseline of the normal curve.	30	11.40	126	47.90	67	25.47	35	13.30	5	1.90	1.58
49. Knowledge of the percentage of the total number of cases included between + or - 1,2 or 3 standard deviations from the mean in a normal distribution.	16	6.08	100	38.02	96	36.50	45	17.11	6	2.28	1.33
50. Knowledge of the fact that the normal curve is an ideal distribution, an abstract model approached but never achieved fully in practice.	127	48.28	101	38.40	24	9.12	8	3.04	3	1.14	2.33
51. Knowledge of the limitations of using the normal curve in practice as the fact that in large heterogeneous groups it "fits" most test data rather well and that it aids in the interpretation of test scores, but does not necessarily apply to small selected groups.	129	49.04	99	37.64	20	7.60	11	4.18	4	1.52	2.33
52. Ability to convert a given raw score into a z score from a mean and standard deviation of a set of scores.	11	4.18	78	29.65	103	39.16	68	25.85	3	1.14	1.12
53. Knowledge of the means and standard deviations of common standard score scales such as the z, T, stanine, deviation IQ and CEEB scales.	10	3.80	73	27.75	84	31.93	89	33.84	7	2.66	1.01
54. Knowledge of the common applications of standard scores.	55	20.91	166	63.11	25	9.50	13	4.94	4	1.52	2.01
55. Knowledge of how to convert from one type of standard score to another.	25	9.50	127	48.28	95	36.12	13	4.94	3	1.14	1.63
56. Knowledge of the fact that the mode, mean and median coincide for a symmetrical distribution.	18	6.84	110	41.82	91	34.60	38	14.44	6	2.28	1.42
57. Knowledge of the meaning of the terms used to designate certain common non-normal distributions such as "positively skewed," "negatively skewed," and "bimodal" distributions.	12	4.56	65	24.71	95	36.12	85	32.31	6	2.28	1.01

TABLE 20--Continued

	Essential 3.0-2.6		Desirable 2.5-1.6		Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0		Do Not Understand .9-0		No Response		Mean Rating
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
58. Knowledge of the fact that any normal distribution can be completely described in terms of its mean and standard deviation.	23	8.74	125	47.52	77	29.27	31	11.78	7	2.66	1.54
59. Ability to define the concept of correlation, including such terms as "positive correlation," "negative correlation," "no relationship" and "perfect relationship."	29	11.02	113	42.96	85	32.31	32	12.16	4	1.52	1.53
60. Knowledge of the significance of the numerical magnitude and the sign of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.	4	1.52	41	15.58	80	30.41	132	50.19	6	2.28	.67
61. Knowledge of the fact that correlation coefficients do not imply causality between two measures.	25	9.50	57	21.67	92	34.98	83	31.55	6	2.28	1.09
62. Knowledge of the fact that correlation coefficients alone do not indicate any kind of percentage.	26	9.88	68	25.85	86	32.69	77	29.27	6	2.28	1.16
63. Understanding of the meaning of a given correlation coefficient in terms of whether it is "high," "low" or "moderate."	30	11.40	103	39.16	68	25.85	53	20.15	9	3.42	1.43
64. Familiarity with the scatter diagram and the ability to make simple interpretations from it.	18	6.84	108	41.06	56	21.29	76	28.89	5	1.90	1.26
65. Knowledge of what size of correlation to expect between two given variables in terms of logical reasoning, e.g., in terms of a common factor.	17	6.46	80	30.41	93	35.36	66	25.09	7	2.66	1.18
66. Understanding of the fact that a raw score has no meaning alone and needs some context in which it can be interpreted.	138	52.47	96	36.50	14	5.32	11	4.18	4	1.52	2.39
67. Familiarity with the nature and uses of the common derived scores, viz., age scales, grade scales, percentile scales and standard score scales.	92	34.98	129	49.04	23	8.74	14	5.32	5	1.90	2.15
68. Understanding of certain concepts associated with scale theory, such as types of scales (nominal, ordinal, cardinal, and absolute); translation of scores to a common scale; units of equal size; and common reference points (zero or the mean).	16	6.08	90	34.22	89	33.84	61	23.19	7	2.66	1.23

TABLE 20--Concluded

	Essential 3.0-2.6		Desirable 2.5-1.6		Of Little Importance 1.5-1.0		Do Not Understand .9-0		No Response		Mean Rating
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
69. Ability to interpret raw scores from a given set of norms.	67	25.47	133	50.57	44	16.73	15	5.70	4	1.52	1.97
70. Understanding of the fact that interpretation of achievement from norms is affected by ability level, cultural background, and curricular factors.	152	57.79	83	31.55	10	3.80	13	4.94	5	1.90	2.44

Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests

Six of the items in the category of Construction and Evaluation of Classroom Tests were rated "Essential." These items (11, 14, 15, 17, 21, and 22) relate generally to teacher-made tests and their uses; knowledge and ability to construct various types of test items, including objective and essay questions; and knowledge of effective marking procedures.

Six items were also rated "Desirable" under this same category. These items (12, 13, 16, 18, 19, and 20) involve the following: relationship of tests to content and behavior, test administration, evaluation, and reporting of test results.

The statement in this category not understood by most of the teachers (57.41 percent, giving the statement a mean rating of .74) is "Familiarity with the blueprint scheme for dealing with the content and behavior dimensions in test planning." No statement in this category has a mean rating indicating it is "Of Little Importance" to the teaching of English. The mean rating placing a statement in the top position under the "Desirable" rating is 2.58 for the item "Knowledge of the techniques of administering a test." The statement receiving the highest mean rating (2.79) is "Knowledge of the general principles of test construction (e.g., planning the test, preparing the test, and evaluating the test)." A percentage of 79.46 establishes that statement as "Essential" to the beginning teacher of English, and it is interesting to note that within this same category, 77.56 percent of the teachers consider also as "Essential" (a mean rating of 2.77) for the beginning teacher "Knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of essay questions."

Uses of Measurement and Evaluation

Within the category of Uses of Measurement and Evaluation, no item is considered as being "Essential." Rather, all thirteen of the items are considered to be "Desirable." Although technical terms such as "profile," "validity," and "reliability" appear in some of these items, most of the statements are concerned with the limitations of various tests and scores, and most seem to be cautionary statements.

The highest mean rating for a statement in this category is 2.54 for "Knowledge of limitations in interpreting IQ scores." This mean places the statement in the "Desirable" rating, but it is considered by 57.41 percent of the teachers as "Essential" for beginning high school English teachers.

Statistical Concepts

It is the ratings of the items in the major category of Statistical Concepts that give the impression that experienced English teachers do not consider the technical aspects of educational measurement and evaluation as being terribly important or really necessary for the beginning high school English teacher. The inference is, also, that the technical and subtle aspects of statistics are not necessary in the teaching of high school English.

Seventeen of the thirty-four statements on Statistical Concepts are rated "Of Little Importance." These items are numbers 38, 39, 44, 48, 49, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, and 68, and are concerned generally with application of measurement tools to test scores.

The thirteen items concerning Statistical Concepts which were rated "Desirable" are numbers 37, 41, 42, 43, 46, 50, 51, 54, 55, 66, 67, 69, and 70, and are concerned generally with understanding ranking, class intervals, the mean, median, and mode, standard deviation, and the normal curve.

The four statements rated "Do Not Understand" are 40, 45, 47, and 60. These statements involve the histogram, frequency polygon, semi-interquartile range, and correlation.

The rating of "Do Not Understand" was by far the one most often used by the teachers in the study when they considered statements under the category of Statistical Concepts. Within this rating, the one statement which the largest percentage of teachers do not understand (50.19%, with a mean rating of .67) is "Knowledge of the significance of the numerical magnitude and the sign of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient."

The largest percentage for the rating "Of Little Importance" is 36.50, and is for the statement "Knowledge of the percentage of the total number of cases included between + or - 1, 2, or 3 standard deviations from the mean in a normal distribution." The mean rating for this statement is 1.33.

A percentage of 63.11 is the largest reported for the rating of "Desirable." This rates at 2.01 the statement "Knowledge of the common applications of standard scores." However, the highest mean rating of all the statements under Statistical Concepts is that of 2.33 for "Knowledge of the limitations of using the normal curve in practice as the fact that in large heterogeneous groups it 'fits' most test data rather well and that it aids in the interpretation of test scores, but does not necessarily apply to small selected groups." Although 49.04 percent of the teachers consider this item "Essential," the mean rating places it only in the "Desirable" range.

No statement in this category received an "Essential" mean rating. Generally, a fair percentage of teachers consider knowledge of and ability to compute simple descriptive statistics of scores as desirable for the beginning English teacher. It appears that it is the more complex statistical terms and methods that are not understood by English teachers or are not considered highly useful in the teaching of English.

Correlations

Table 21 reports the correlation matrix for highest degree held, years of teaching experience, number of hours beyond the highest degree held, number of courses in educational measurement, and number of courses in educational psychology, English methods, or other professional educational courses in which educational measurement was covered, with the overall and sub-mean ratings of the statements and the major categories of the Checklist. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was obtained on a 1620 electronic solid-state computer. A correlation coefficient of .14 or larger is necessary for statistical significance at the .01 level, with 300 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed test.

A statistically significant correlation was obtained for the number of courses in educational measurement and the sub- and overall mean ratings of the statements in the Checklist. There were no significant correlations obtained for the other items in question, and it is doubtful that even trends should be suggested since the values reported are relatively low. However, there is a positive relationship indicated for level of degree, for number of hours beyond the highest degree, and for number of years of teaching experience, except for the correlation with the mean ratings of the statements within the major category of Statistical Concepts. Here, there is a negative correlation indicated, and this appears to confirm the previous evaluations reported for the items in the category of Statistical Concepts. There are also negative relationships for the number of courses in which educational measurement was only briefly covered and for three of the four sub-mean ratings as well as the overall mean ratings. It appears that the educational psychology, English methods, or other professional education courses taken by the teachers in this sample did not completely or sufficiently cover educational measurement and evaluation.

It is interesting to note that the correlation of the number of hours beyond the highest degree earned with the mean ratings of the major category Uses of Measurement and Evaluation is almost statistically significant at the .05 level. (At the .05 level of significance, for a two-tailed test and with 300 degrees of freedom, an r of .11 or larger is required. For both the .01 and .05 levels of significance, the value of r is being used for 300 degrees of freedom because all tables consulted did not list the value of r for the N of 263 and the appropriate degrees of freedom for the sample in this study. Perhaps this exact value of r would indicate that the correlation in question is definitely statistically significant.) The coefficient of .10 may well indicate that many of the courses taken beyond the highest degree earned are in educational measurement.

Interpretation of the correlations and the data previously reported appears to indicate that preparation in educational measurement <u>per se</u> is necessary if beginning teachers are to understand the concepts and possess the competencies in educational measurement and evaluation which experienced English teachers consider important for future high school English teachers.

TABLE 21

Correlation Matrix of Independent and Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables				
	Standardized Tests Items 1-10	Construction and Eval. of Classroom Tests Items 11-23	Uses of Measurement Evaluation Items 24-36	Statistical Concepts Items 37-70	Overall Mean Items 1-70
Highest Degree	.01	.03	.09	.05	.06
Years of Teaching Experience	.05	.04	.05	-.01	.02
Hours Beyond Highest Degree	.05	.08	.10	.02	.06
Courses in Ed. Measurement	.25	.26	.21	.30	.32
Courses in Ed. Psychology, English Methods, and Others	-.05	-.04	.02	-.007	-.02

(N=263; df=300; r=.14 at .01 level, two-tailed test of significance.)

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Over half the teachers who participated in this study (63.89%) indicated that their present knowledge of educational measurement and evaluation is sufficient for their needs as English teachers. However, 36.11 percent felt that their knowledge or preparation is inadequate. Comments made by the respondents indicate specific areas of weakness existing in the abilities to select appropriate tests, to interpret test results, to construct tests, and to determine what is measurable in English.

The majority of the respondents (69.58%) believe that a prospective secondary school English teacher should have as a portion of his undergraduate preparation a substantial amount of training in educational measurement and evaluation, going beyond what is presently given in most programs for prospective secondary school English teachers. Thirty-four of the teachers (12.93%) did not agree with this, and forty-two (15.96%) of the teachers were undecided.

The statistically significant correlation for number of courses in educational measurement and evaluation indicates that a course in educational measurement *per se* rather than other courses which cover measurement along with many other topics is probably necessary for a prospective English teacher if he is to possess those concepts and competencies in measurement and evaluation that experienced English teachers consider important for him to possess. Also, the rather high correlation (almost significant at the .05 level) for the number of hours beyond the highest degree and the evaluations of the Checklist statements indicates that most teachers who had taken measurement and evaluation courses probably took them at a post-degree level. Since the importance and applicability of the concepts and abilities in measurement have been established for high school English teachers, substantial preparation in measurement and evaluation should be in the curriculum for prospective high school English teachers.

All the findings of this research study, as well as the conclusions stated above, clearly validate the measurement and evaluation competency recommended in ISCPET's Qualifications Statement: that beginning teachers of secondary school English should possess, at least, a broad understanding of the basic principles of evaluation and test construction in English.

CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

If beginning English teachers with a bachelor's degree are to possess the knowledge of and competency in educational measurement and evaluation that the findings of this study indicate are both desirable and necessary, substantial training in these areas of study--more than is currently offered at the undergraduate level in all but a very few colleges and universities--should be a required part of the preparatory programs of prospective secondary school English teachers.

Professors of measurement and evaluation, of educational psychology, of general and English methods, and of reading methods should together make a careful analysis and assessment of their current offerings in educational measurement and evaluation at the undergraduate level, and then design a specific plan or program that would assure coverage, either in a single course or in a series of units within a number of courses, of the principles, concepts, and skills necessary to give the beginning teacher at least a broad understanding of evaluation and test construction.

Although the several Checklist statements which involve somewhat sophisticated terms and concepts in measurement and statistics were considered relatively unimportant by many of the respondents in the study, secondary school teachers should realize that they are one of the prime audiences for dissemination of the results of educational research and one of the prime sources of data for the conducting of experimental and applied research studies. Therefore, in order to serve both roles satisfactorily, they need to possess fairly sophisticated knowledge and abilities in measurement and evaluation--not to speak of what they need to know and be able to do if they are to conduct research in their own classrooms.

An advanced course (probably on the graduate level) in research design and methodology, directly related to the problems of research in English and English teaching, would no doubt encourage secondary school teachers to make wider and more sophisticated use of research findings and to conduct additional and more sophisticated research in their own classrooms. Teachers who plan to remain in the profession need a thorough understanding of educational measurement and evaluation.

The responses of the teachers in this study to the Checklist and to many parts of the Questionnaire could very well serve as a guide to professors of measurement and evaluation, educational psychology, and English and reading methods in planning for instruction in measurement and evaluation in their various courses.

With certain adaptations, the Checklist and parts of the Questionnaire could be used for diagnostic purposes by professors in their courses in measurement and evaluation, educational psychology, and English and reading methods, and by school supervisors of English, reading, and guidance and counseling.

Inservice programs in educational measurement and evaluation are essential for classroom teachers, as well as for guidance and counseling personnel. The low correlations obtained in this study for years of teaching experience with the ratings on the seventy Checklist statements indicate that perhaps as years go by teachers become less effective, or at least no more effective, in planning their objectives for teaching and then in evaluating what they have actually tried to teach. Programs should be planned so that inservice English teachers can become better acquainted, or reacquainted, with new methods and materials for testing student achievement in English and for evaluating instruction in English. Obviously, English teachers, department heads, and guidance counselors need to work together more closely if the objective of this recommendation is to be achieved.

A comparative study of the findings of this research project and certain of the findings of Professor Mayo's project should be made.

A replication of this study should be conducted in various parts of the country and possibly in other subject fields.

A study should be conducted to obtain information on the particular facets of measurement and evaluation that would most suitably be covered at the undergraduate level, at the inservice level, and at the graduate level.

The profession is in critical need of research into the countless factors and problems involved in the stating of instructional objectives, then in the teaching toward achievement of those objectives, and finally in the testing of what has actually been taught.

APPENDIX A

Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of
Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET)
University of Illinois
1210 West California
Urbana, Illinois 61801

QUESTIONNAIRE ON EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT IN ENGLISH

Date: _____

Name: _____ Sex: M____ F____

School and Address: _____

1. How many years have you been a teacher? ____
2. How many English classes do you teach each day? ____
3. On what grade level(s) are your classes? ____
4. How many lesson preparations do you make each day? ____
5. What is the average number of students per class? ____
6. How many students are enrolled in your school? ____
7. What is the highest degree that you hold? ____
8. In what year was your degree conferred? ____
9. How many semester hours have you taken beyond that degree? ____
10. Have you taken any courses in educational measurement and evaluation, including the construction of tests and the use of tests and test results?

    Yes__

    No___

    If so, what were the course titles, the levels of the courses and the credit given?

Course Titles	Level (Jr., Sr. Master's, Doctor's)	Credit (Sem. Hours)
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

11. If you have not taken any courses in educational measurement and evaluation, how did you learn what you now know about these subjects? (Indicate all that apply to you by placing an "X" beside them.)

a. Through a course in educational psychology _____

b. Through an English methods course _____

c. Through other professional courses in education _____

If through such courses, please give their titles:

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. Through individual reading of professional articles and books _____

e. Through experience during student teaching _____

f. Through experience in my own classroom _____

g. Through assisting colleagues in the administration of standardized tests in their classrooms _____

h. Through informal conversation with other faculty members _____

i. Through inservice meetings, workshops, or institutes _____

j. From other sources (please specify)_____

_____

_____

12. Do you believe that your present knowledge of educational measurement and evaluation is adequate for your needs as a teacher of English?

Yes_____
No_____

If no, in what respect is your knowledge inadequate? Please explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. In your opinion, should prospective teachers of English be required to have undergraduate training in educational measurement and evaluation?

Yes_____
No_____
Undecided_

(Use this space if you would like to comment.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Indicate the types of teacher-made test questions which you ask and the degree of frequency with which you ask them by writing the appropriate letter on the line to the right of each type of question.

A - Frequently (at least once each week)
B - Fairly frequently (at least once each six weeks)
C - Occasionally (at least once each semester)
D - Rarely (at least once each year)
E - Never

Be sure to write a letter after every type of test question.

a. True-False or Yes-No _____

b. Multiple Choice _____

c. Matching _____

d. Completion _____

e. Short Answer _____

f. Essay _____

15. Indicate other means of measurement which you use and the degree of frequency with which you use them by writing the appropriate letter on the line to the right of each means.

A - Frequently (at least once each week)
B - Fairly frequently (at least once each six weeks)
C - Occasionally (at least once each semester)
D - Rarely (at least once each year)
E - Never

Be sure to write a letter after every means of measurement.

a. Reading interest inventories _____

b. Cumulative reading records _____

c. Oral reports on individual reading _____

d. Written reports on individual reading _____

e. Conferences with individual students _____

f. Cumulative writing folders _____

g. Informal diagnostic questioning _____

h. Anecdotal records _____

i. Tape recordings of students' speech _____

j. Observation of students' use of language in social situations _____

k. Evaluation checklists designed for a variety of situations _____

l. Students' individual cumulative lists of spelling errors _____

m. Class notebooks _____

n. Term papers _____

o. Handwriting scales _____

p. Attitude scales _____

q. Student self-evaluation _____

r. Peer appraisal _____

s. Themes _____

t. Other means: _____

_____

_____

_____

16. On the average, how often do you give quizzes or tests (oral or written) to a given class? (Indicate your answers by writing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

a. Daily _____

b. Weekly _____

c. Once each three weeks _____

d. Once each six weeks _____

e. Once each semester _____

17. Do you ever ask for criticism of your test items? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, from whom? (Place an "X" beside as many as are appropriate.)

a. Students _____

b. Fellow teachers _____

c. Department head _____

d. Guidance counselor _____

e. Principal _____

f. Others (please specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

18. Do you ever make an item analysis of your tests and then try to find out why students answered questions right or wrong? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, how often? (Indicate your answer by writing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

a. Always _____

b. Frequently (approximately one test each six weeks) _____

c. Occasionally (approximately one test each semester) _____

d. Rarely (approximately one test each year) _____

e. Never _____

19. After returning tests to students, do you discuss their results with them? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, to what extent, and for what purposes? (Please explain.)

_____

_____

If yes, how often? (Indicate your answer by writing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

a. Always _____

b. Frequently (about once every six weeks) _____

c. Occasionally (about once every semester) _____

d. Rarely (about once every year) _____

e. Never _____

20. Do you use test results in planning for instruction? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, please explain how.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. Have you ever had experience in working with fellow teachers of English to develop departmental grade-level tests? Yes_____ No_____

22. Does your present English department administer departmental grade-level tests? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, who prepared the tests? (Indicate your answer by writing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

a. Individual teachers _____

b. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head _____

c. Individual teachers with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

d. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head and the guidance counselor _____

e. A committee of teachers _____

f. A committee assisted by the department head _____

g. A committee assisted by the guidance counselor _____

h. A committee assisted by the department head and the guidance counselor _____

i. All members of the department _____

j. All members of the department with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

k. The department head _____

l. Others (please specify)

_____

_____

_____

_____

If yes, which particular tests are departmental? (Indicate your answer[s] by writing "X" in the appropriate blank[s].)

a. Six-week tests _____

b. Semester tests _____

c. End-of-year tests _____

d. Others (please specify)

_____

_____

_____

23. Is [Are] a standardized English test[s] administered on a regular basis in your school? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, what is [are] the title[s]?

_____

_____

_____

24. (To be answered only if an affirmative answer was given to #23.)

Who selects the standardized English test[s] used in your school? (Indicate your answer by writing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

a. Individual teachers _____

b. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head _____

c. Individual teachers with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

d. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head and the guidance counselor _____

e. A committee of teachers _____

f. A committee assisted by the department head _____

g. A committee assisted by the guidance counselor _____

h. A committee assisted by the department head and the guidance counselor _____

i. All members of the department _____

j. All members of the department with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

k. The department head _____

l. Others (please specify)

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. (To be answered only if an affirmative answer was given to #23.)

Who administers the standardized English test[s] used in your school? (Indicate your answer by writing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

a. Individual teachers _____

b. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head _____

c. Individual teachers with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

d. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head and the guidance counselor _____

e. A committee of teachers _____

f. A committee assisted by the department head _____

g. A committee assisted by the guidance counselor _____

h. A committee assisted by the department head and the guidance counselor _____

i. All members of the department _____

j. All members of the department with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

k. The department head _____

l. Others (please specify)

_____

_____

_____

26. (To be answered only if an affirmative answer was given to #23.)

Who interprets the results of the standardized English test[s] used in your school? (Indicate your answer by writing an "X" in the appropriate blank.)

a. Individual teachers _____

b. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head _____

c. Individual teachers with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

d. Individual teachers with assistance from the department head and the guidance counselor _____

e. A committee of teachers _____

f. A committee assisted by the department head _____

g. A committee assisted by the guidance counselor _____

h. A committee assisted by the department head and the guidance counselor _____

i. All members of the department _____

j. All members of the department with assistance from the guidance counselor _____

k. The department head _____

l. Others (please specify)

_____

_____

27. Has the content of your courses been influenced in any way by standardized tests administered in your school?

Yes_____
No_____

If yes, please explain how.

_____

_____

_____

28. Should teachers alter their courses to bring them in line with college-admissions tests, as well as other standardized tests administered on a broad scale?

Yes_____
No_____

29. Please indicate your degree of familiarity with the following standardized high school English tests by writing the appropriate letter on the line to the right of each test title.

A - Have never heard of the test.
B - Recognize the title, but have no other knowledge about the test.
C - Have studied about the test and know what it measures in a general way, but have never used it.
D - Have examined the test itself and am familiar with it, but have never used it.
E - Have used the test.

Be sure to write a letter after every test title.

a. College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) Advanced Placement Examination: English _____

b. Cooperative English Test: Usage, Spelling, and Vocabulary _____

c. Cooperative English Test (1960 Revision) _____

d. Essentials of English Tests (Revised Edition) _____

e. The Iowa Tests of Educational Development[ITED]: Test 3, Correctness and Appropriateness of Expression _____

f. Metropolitan Achievement Tests: Advanced Battery (Grades 7-9) _____

g. Metropolitan Achievement Tests: High School Language Tests _____

h. The Purdue High School English Test _____

i. SRA Achievement Series: Language Arts _____

j. Stanford Achievement Test: Spelling and Language _____

k. College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) Writing Sample _____

l. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP): Essay Test _____

m. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP): Writing _____

n. Gates Reading Survey _____

o. Iowa Silent Reading Tests: New Edition _____

p. Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Reading) _____

q. The Nelson-Denny Reading Test: Vocabulary-Comprehension Rate _____

r. Reading Comprehension: Cooperative English Tests _____

s. SRA Achievement Series: Reading _____

t. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP): Reading _____

u. Stanford Achievement Test: (Reading Tests) _____

v. Diagnostic Reading Scales _____

w. Diagnostic Reading Tests _____

x. The Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED): Test 7, Ability to Interpret Literary Materials _____

y. Barrett-Ryan Literature Test _____

z. Center-Durost Literature Acquaintance Test _____

aa. Cooperative Literary Comprehension and Appreciation Test _____

bb. The New Iowa Spelling Scale _____

cc. Traxler High School Spelling Test _____

dd. Cooperative Vocabulary Test _____

ee. Durost-Center Word Mastery Test: Evaluation and Adjustment Series _____

ff. The Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED): Test 8, General Vocabulary _____

gg. Other standardized English tests: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. Please indicate your degree of familiarity with the following publications on educational measurement and evaluation by writing the appropriate letter on the line to the right of the title of each publication.

A - Have never heard of the publication.
B - Recognize the title, but have no other knowledge about the publication.
C - Have a general knowledge about the publication.
D - Have scanned the publication and am fairly familiar with it.
E - Have read and used the publication.

Be sure to write a letter after every title.

a. Adams, Georgia. Measurement and Evaluation for the Secondary School Teacher. _____

b. Ahmann and Glock. Evaluating Pupil Growth. (either edition) _____

c. Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.) Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. _____

d. Bauernfeind, R. H. Building a School Testing Program. _____

e. Buros, O. K. The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. (or any previous edition) _____

f. Buros, O. K. Tests in Print. _____

g. Carruthers, Robert. Building Better English Tests. _____

h. Durost, Walter N.; and Prescott, George A. Essentials of Measurement for Teachers. _____

i. Garrett, Henry E. Testing for Teachers. _____

j. Gerberich, Joseph Raymond. Measurement and Evaluation in the Modern School. _____

k. Gerberich, Joseph Raymond. Specimen Objective Test Items: A Guide to Achievement Test Construction. _____

l. Gronlund, Norman E. Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching. _____

m. Green, John A. Teacher-Made Tests. _____

n. Harris, Chester W. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research. (any edition) _____

o. Krathwohl, David R.; Bloom, Benjamin S.; and Masia, Bertram B. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. _____

p. Lindquist, E. F. Educational Measurement. _____

q. Manuel, Herschel T. Elementary Statistics for Teachers. _____

r. Noll, Victor H. Introduction to Educational Measurement. _____

s. Smith, Fred M.; and Adams, Sam. Educational Measurement for the Classroom Teacher. _____

t. Stanley, Julian C. Measurement in Today's Schools. _____

u. Thorndike, Robert L.; and Hagen, Elizabeth. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. _____

v. Travers, Robert M. W. How to Make Achievement Tests. _____

w. Traxler, Arthur E.; Jacobs, Robert; Selover, Margaret I.; and Townsend, Agatha. Introduction to Testing and the Use of Test Results in Public Schools. _____

x. Wood, Dorothy Adkins. Test Construction. _____

y. Other authors and books: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A NOTE TO THE RESPONDENT:

Thank you for your assistance. We are indeed grateful for your reactions and for the time and energy that you have given to the Questionnaire and the Checklist.

If you would like to receive a copy of the report on this study, please write your name, address and ZIP Code Number here: _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

Instructions for Completing CHECKLIST OF MEASUREMENT COMPETENCIES*

CHECKLIST OF MEASUREMENT COMPETENCIES

Directions:

Please respond to the statements below in terms of the knowledge, ability, and understanding which you believe the beginning teacher with a Bachelor's degree should possess.

Using an "X" mark, indicate whether you believe that each of the competencies "Is Essential," "Is Desirable," or "Is of Little Importance" to the work of the beginning teacher. If you do not understand some part of the statement check with an "X" in the last column at right entitled "Do Not Understand Statement." Also circle the part or parts of the statement which you do not understand. You may also wish to qualify your responses by writing in comments. If you wish to add any competencies which should have been included, feel free to do so on separate pages.

	Is Essential	Is Desirable	Is of Little Importance	Do Not Understand Statement
1. Knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of standardized tests.				
2. Ability to compare standardized with teacher-made tests and choose appropriately in a local situation.				

*Since all of the 70 items on the CHECKLIST appear in Chapter IV (see Table 19), it was decided that to reproduce the entire CHECKLIST here would be unnecessary.